



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/784,008	02/19/2004	James L. Adamson	3435.02US01	6980
24113 7590 02/15/2011 PATTERSON THUENTE CHRISTENSEN PEDERSEN, P.A. 4800 IDS CENTER 80 SOUTH 8TH STREET MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-2100				
EXAMINER SALLARD, SHANNON S				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3628				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
02/15/2011		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/784,008

Applicant(s)

ADAMSON ET AL.

Examiner

SHANNON S. SALIARD

Art Unit

3628

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 July 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11, 13-18, 22 and 24-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11, 13-18, 22 and 24-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-945)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Claims

1. Applicant has amended claims 1, 11, and 22. Claims 12, 19-21, and 23 have been cancelled. No claims have been newly added. Thus, claims 1-11, 13-18, 22, and 24-29 remain pending and are presented for examination.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 06 July 2010, with respect to the rejections of claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. 101, have been fully considered and are persuasive. Thus, the rejections of claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. 101 has been withdrawn.

3. Applicant's arguments filed 06 July 2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

4. Applicant argues, "Sheth does not teach a CVB organization having a plurality of independent service providers as members as claimed....Specifically, the private marketplace owner 104 and users 108 in Sheth are using the service to *procure* services for the owner 104 and its employee users 108. It is only the vendors 106 in Sheth who are *providing* services... The arguments set forth in the Office Action with respect to independent claims 1, 11 and 22 all specifically equate the owner 104/users 108 with the claimed CVB organization and the independent plurality of service providers who are members of the CVB organization. Consequently, the "mapping" of Sheth onto each of the claimed elements as set forth in the Office Action is inapposite because it is the owner/users of Seth are the ones who are preparing and submitting an

RFP. In contrast, the CVB and its members are responding to an RFP submitted by an outside organization.” However, the Examiner disagrees. Sheth discloses, “The private marketplace manager 107 is the portion of the private marketplace owner 104 that is responsible for customizing the look and feel of the private marketplace, determining which users and vendors will have access to the private marketplace, managing the business reports, and determining the types of services to be procured. The private marketplace users 108 may be employees or members of the private marketplace owner 104 or other software programs performing a procurement function. The private marketplace users 108 together with the vendors 106 are allowed exclusive access to the private market. The private marketplace users 108 post the RFPs to procure services needed by the private marketplace owner 104” (0073). Since it is known that an owner employs a manager, and the manager is helping to setup the system for use by the users and vendors; Sheth teaches that the CVB is an organization including representatives (i.e., manager) who is tasked with working with event organizers (i.e. users) and independent service providers (i.e., vendors).

5. Applicant also argues, “In addition the projects referenced in Sheth cannot be equated to the claimed destination events hosted by a city of metropolitan or regional area.” However, the Examiner notes that the recitation of the invention being directed to an event hosted in a city or regional or metropolitan area has been given little patentable weight because the recitation occurs in the preamble. A preamble is generally not accorded any patentable weight where it merely recites the purpose of a process or the intended use of a structure, and where the body of the claim does not

depend on the preamble for completeness but, instead, the process steps or structural limitations are able to stand alone. See *In re Hirao*, 535 F.2d 67, 190 USPQ 15 (CCPA 1976) and *Kropa v. Robie*, 187 F.2d 150, 152, 88 USPQ 478, 481 (CCPA 1951).

6. Applicant further argues, "There is absolutely nothing about Sheth that teaches anything relating to the claimed aggregating of multiple bids by different member service providers into a common database from which a unified response to an RFP prepared." However, the Examiner asserts that the claim reads, "prepare[ing] an aggregated response to the RFGP that includes information about services from at least two members of the CVB that is then communicated to the potential destination event organizer." Thus, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., aggregating the bids into a common database from which a unified RFP is prepared) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

7. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

8. **Claims 1-11, 13-18, 22, and 24-29** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to

reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The limitation "wherein the CVB organization is not providing services in competition with services provided by the services provided by the plurality of independent services providers that are members of the CVB organization" does not have support within the specification. The Applicant must either direct the Examiner to the portions of the specification that provide support for the limitation or remove the limitation from the claim.

9. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

10. **Claims 1-11, 13-18, 22, and 24-29** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

As per **claims 1, 11, and 22**, the limitation " wherein the CVB organization is not providing services in competition with services provided by the services provided by the plurality of independent services providers that are members of the CVB organization" as written is vague and indefinite. It is unclear to the Examiner what the Applicant is attempting to set forth. Appropriate correction is required. Furthermore, the limitation "the plurality of independent services providers" in line 13 of the claim is also vague and indefinite. There is lack of antecedent basis in the claim for this limitation.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

11. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

12. **Claims 1, 2, 9, 11, 18, 22, and 29** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sheth [US 2001/0032170] in view of Wright et al [US 6,581,040], and Munson [US 2002/0091767].

As per **claims 1, 11, and 22**, Sheth discloses a method comprising:

receiving a request for proposal (RFP) from an organizer requesting information from a convention visitor bureau (CVB) organization, wherein the CVB organization is an organization including representatives employed by or contracted by the CVB organization who are tasked with promoting a given destination and working with organizers in organizing events at the given destination event and a plurality of independent service providers that are members of the CVB organization, wherein the CVB organization is not providing services in competition with services provided by the services provided by the plurality of independent services providers that are members of the CVB organization [0072; 0074; 0085; 0086; 0089; 0090; user posts a RFP to marketplace that consists of a marketplace owner and manager that represent and/or promote the event by posting RFP on their marketplace for vendors to view];

having the CVB organization compile related information about the RFP and electronically publish the RFP and related information on a member user interface hosted by an application service provider and accessible to the plurality of independent service providers that are members of the CVB organization and are not the representatives of the CVB organization [0015; 0017; 0069; 0079; 0083; 0101; 0120; marketplace owner can easily submit a RFP, via a web application, to an exclusive group of registered vendors];

having at least two of the members of the CVB organization periodically log into the member user interface hosted by a computing system maintained by an application service provider to review the RFP and related information [0091; vendors review a list of posted projects] and, in response, complete an electronic form on the member user interface for any services responsive to the RFP that the member is willing to make available [0093; 0095]; wherein the data related to the services contained in the completed form is confidential to the CVB organization and the member of the CVB organization who is willing to make said services available [0073; 0074; private marketplace];

automatically incorporating information from the electronic form into a projected service availability database stored in a storage system maintained by the application service provider [0074; 0093; 0101; 0135; vendor submits bids through form on interface and database stores info on the bid];

having the CVB organization prepare an aggregated response to the RFP that includes information about services from at least two members of the CVB that is then communicated to organizer [0086; 0095; 0146]; and

if the organizer accepts the response to the RFP for the project, having the CVB electronically communicate with each of the at least two members of the CVB that the response to the RFP has been accepted and that each member can enter into bilateral contracts directly with the organizer for the services identified in the electronic form for the project [0086; 0088].

Sheth does not disclose having the CVB organization review the projected service availability database for the RFP for the given destination event. However, Wright et al discloses automatically incorporating information from the electronic form into a projected service availability database stored in a storage system maintained by the application service provider and having the CVB organization review the projected service availability database for the RFP for the given destination event [col 10, lines 9-25]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include in the RFP system of Sheth et al the ability to incorporate information from the electronic form into a projected service availability database as taught by Wright et al since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

Sheth does not disclose that the information in the database is accessible only by the CVB. However, Wright et al disclose that the complete database is not available to every user (col 10, lines 10-12). Hence, it is well within the knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to manage database rights so that only one organization would have rights to specific database (e.g. projected service availability database). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the invention of Sheth with Wright et al and include providing the CVB with the only rights to access the projected service availability database for security purposes.

The sole difference between Sheth in view of Wright et al and the claimed subject matter is that Sheth in view of Wright et al does not disclose that the process is for a destination event. Sheth in view of Wright et al discloses the process as it relates to a project and the claim calls for a destination event. Munson discloses requesting an RFP for a destination event (0004). Munson shows that the use of an RFP process for organizing an event was known in the prior art at the time of the invention.

Since each individual element and its function are shown in the prior art, albeit shown in separate references, the difference between the claimed subject matter and the prior art rests not on any individual element or function but in the very combination itself -- that is in the simple substitution of the RFP for an destination event in Munson for the RFP process for a project in Sheth in view of Wright et al. Thus, the simple substitution of one known element for another producing a predictable result renders the claim obvious.

As per **claim 2**, Sheth in view of Wright et al and Munson disclose all the limitations of claim 1. Wright et al further discloses wherein updates to information in an RFP provided by the potential destination event organizer is automatically made available by the CVB to members via the member user interface [col 9, lines 29-37]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include in the RFP system of the modified Sheth the ability to make update automatically available as taught in Wright since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

As per **claims 9, 18, and 29**, Sheth in view of Wright et al and Munson disclose all the limitations of claim 1, 11, and 22. Wright et al further discloses wherein the application service provider also hosts a customer webpage interface and the potential destination event organizer submits the RFP for a given destination event via the customer webpage interface [col 11, lines 11-20]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include in the RFP system of the modified the ability to submit the RFP via a webpage as taught in Wright since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

13. **Claim 5-8, 15-17, and 26-28** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sheth [US 2001/0032170] in view of Wright et al [US 6,581,040], and Munson [US 2002/0091767] as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Tromczynski et al [US 2006/0010023].

As per **claim 5**, Sheth in view of Wright et al and Munson do not disclose explicitly wherein the RFP includes a date by which the response is due and the application service provider automatically sends email reminders to members if the members have not submitted electronic form for the RFP prior to the date by which the response is due. However, Tromczynski et al discloses sending a reminder to service providers as the due date for RFPs approaches [0048]. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the invention of Sheth in view of Wright et al and Munson to include wherein the RFP includes a date by which the response is due and the application service provider automatically sends email reminders to members if the members have not submitted electronic form for the RFP prior to the date by which the response is due as taught by Tromczynski et al so that all providers are provided an opportunity to reply.

As per **claims 6, 15, and 26**, Sheth in view of Wright et al and Munson do not explicitly disclose wherein the members of the CVB organization include at least two hotel members and the electronic form for the hotel members includes availability and prices for blocks of hotel rooms in response to the RFP, and wherein the projected service availability database includes a projected occupancy room flow for the destination that the CVB organization utilizes in preparing the response to the RFP.

However, Tromczynski et al discloses that CVB organization includes a hotel and the hotel provides availability and prices for rooms. Tromczynski et al further discloses that the number of available guest rooms is considered when accepting a provider [0038]. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the invention of Sheth in view of Wright et al and Munson to include the method disclosed by Tromczynski et al to ensure proper accommodations.

As per **claims 7, 16, and 27**, Sheth in view of Wright et al and Munson do not explicitly disclose wherein the application service provider includes a software module that automatically analyzes the projected occupancy room flow and generates a hotel availability portion of the response to the RFP. However, Tromczynski et al discloses providing summaries of availability for services for a required date [0038]. Further, it is not 'invention' to broadly provide a mechanical or automatic means to replace manual activity which has accomplished the same result, see *In re Venner*, 120 USPQ 192 (CCPA 1958). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the invention of Sheth in view of Wright et al and Munson to include the method disclosed by Tromczynski et al so that organizer makes a well informed decision.

As per **claims 8, 17, and 28**, Sheth in view of Wright et al and Munson do not explicitly disclose wherein the application service provider hosts a software module that selectively integrates portions of the projected service availability database in order to display on the member user interface non-confidential summaries of the future availability of selected services for the destination by date. However, Tromczynski et al

discloses providing non-confidential (i.e., published on website) summaries of availability for services for a required date wherein the availability is stored in a database [0038]. Further, it is not 'invention' to broadly provide a mechanical or automatic means to replace manual activity which has accomplished the same result, see *In re Venner*, 120 USPQ 192 (CCPA 1958). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the invention of Sheth in view of Wright et al and Munson to include the method disclosed by Tromczynski et al so that organizer makes a well informed decision.

14. **Claims 3, 4, 13, 14, 24, and 25** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sheth [US 2001/0032170] in view of Wright et al [US 6,581,040], and Munson [US 2002/0091767] as applied to claim 1 above, and in further view of Creedle et al [US 2008/0133307].

As per **claims 3, 13, and 24**, Sheth in view of Wright et al and Munson do not explicitly disclose wherein once the electronic form is submitted by a member, any changes to the electronic form made by a member are made to the projected service availability database only when approved by the CVB. However, Creedle et al discloses any changes to the project proposal are approved by schedule reviewer/ general contractor (CVB) [0045; 0055]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include in the RFP system of Sheth in view of Wright et al and Munson the ability to allow the CVB to approve changes made by a member taught by Creedle et al since

the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

As per **claims 4, 14, and 25** in view of Wright et al and Munson do not disclose wherein the application service provider automatically maintains an audit trail of all information submitted by each member via the electronic form to the projected service availability database and all changes approved by the CVB. However, Creedle et al Creedle et al discloses any changes to the project proposal are approved by schedule reviewer/ general contractor (CVB) [0045; 0055]. Creedle et al further discloses that the project auditor can view audit trails for the project [0045]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include in RFP system of Sheth in view of Wright et al and Munson al the ability to maintain an audit trail of changes as taught by Creedle et al since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

15. **Claim 10** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sheth [US 2001/0032170] in view of Wright et al [US 6,581,040], and Munson [US 2002/0091767] as applied to claim 1 above, and in further view of Official Notice.

As per **claim 10**, Sheth in view of Wright et al and Munson do not disclose wherein software modules that support the member user interface and the projected services availability database are updated and maintained by the application service provider and not by the CVB organization. However, the Examiner takes Official Notice that it is old and well known in the computer industry to have an application service provider update and maintain software. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the invention of Sheth in view of Wright et al and Munson to include wherein software modules that support the member user interface and the projected services availability database are updated and maintained by the application service provider and not by the CVB organization to streamline operations.

Conclusion

16. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SHANNON S. SALIARD whose telephone number is (571)272-5587. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 8:00 am - 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John W. Hayes can be reached on 571-272-6708. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Please address mail to be delivered by the United States Postal Service (USPS) as follows:

***Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231***

Or faxed to:

(571) 273-5587 [Informal/ Draft Communications, labeled

"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT"]

Hand delivered responses should be brought to the Customer Service Window,
Randolph Building, 401 Dulany Street, Alexandria, VA 22314

Shannon S Saliard
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3628

/Shannon S Saliard/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3628